



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

concedes the inadequacy of all solutions and admits (*il faut admettre*) that the primitive preaching must have taken place under forms more various and conditions more complicated than hitherto supposed. This concession seems to me to go very far, much beyond what Loisy intended. Clemen takes the bull by the horns, frankly declaring that the author of Acts must have erred. Soltau admits that the reference in τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ must be to the *cult* (*Religionsanschauung*) and not to the historic content of the life of Jesus. Into this list of warring explanations Professor Lovejoy's may enter with the rest. To my mind it goes far aside into irrelevant matters, leaving the knot of the difficulty untouched. It is at best what a chemist might call a 2% solution.

In conclusion, let me reiterate that the argument of the book cannot be judged save by the laws of cumulative evidence. It is the *whole* body of facts adduced that must be adjusted into some self-consistent scheme of interpretation. We must restore in thought the unity and coherence that undoubtedly bound them together originally. Nor let any one imagine, as does Professor Lovejoy apparently, that practically the whole body of evidence thus far accumulated or at least the most important elements have been presented in *Der vorchristliche Jesus*. That work was in fact a reconnoissance in force. The mass of evidential matter already gathered is three or four times as great and in my judgment has independently even greater demonstrative power. Of course, the examination is not yet complete; in the nature of the case it cannot be completed, but it seems to have gone far enough even now to indicate clearly that (to quote a distinguished British scholar and philosopher) this new "conception of the *Origines* of Christianity is in the main on right lines."

WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH.

TULANE UNIVERSITY, NEW ORLEANS.

THE FUTURE OF ARTIFICIAL LANGUAGES.

I am somewhat at a loss to understand why any Monist does not readily grasp the idea of an auxiliary international language, for I read:

"Monism is a unitary conception of the world. The world must be conceived as one inseparable and indivisible entirety. It admits of a constantly increasing realization and of a future perfection. The monistic idea of a unitary conception of the world

has been constantly corroborated by the progress of science," etc.—*Primer of Philosophy*, pp. 4-5.

But I take it that the able advocate of monism has no quarrel with the adoption of some "natural" language, preferably English, as an international medium, but rather questions the necessity or feasibility of an artificial language and prefers the more comfortable rôle of a spectator merely.

Let us first examine such claims for the English for a brief space and see where we may arrive, prefacing my remarks with the assertion, that, personally, I would look upon the universal adoption of any existing language as almost in the nature of a calamity, while admitting the progress English has been making.

Not touching here upon its irregularities or whether the Mohammedans can ever be induced or compelled to accept it, the illogisms of our really great mother tongue are almost intolerable to any one aiming at clarity of thought. For example, we say "the sun is rising" or "is setting" when it is the motion of our own planet that has deceived our senses. We say "I am disgusted with" when we really mean at, or from, or against, and a very recent account in a local paper describes the distressing accident to a Scandinavian carpenter working in the lower story of a mill under construction. When he heard the cry "Look out!" of some men canting a log above, the unfortunate man literally obeyed by thrusting his head out of a window, and as a result was practically decapitated. But why continue, for I know that French and assume that every other existing tongue, have such, or greater crudities, yet none such could be tolerated in any well-constructed artificial language, for example, like "Ilo" (the latest evolution of Esperanto, as simplified and reformed), and a greater familiarity with either of these systems must explain any preference for exemplifying them herein.

Again, how many words we often have to use for expressing a simple idea when one appropriate word should suffice, as *pen-valorar*, "to be worth the pains." When the child was asked "Have you a good memory?" and he truthfully and logically answered "No, but I have a bad *forgetency*," he was considered both amusing and original, yet I have often thought that if we could have a competent and authoritative academy (as indeed most artificial languages have) for our own tongue, it might possibly be able to do something in the way of correcting our illogisms, modify many of our irregularities and improve our phonology; but I fear this would be expecting altogether too much, as most living or natural lan-

guages become too stereotyped and there is generally much prejudice against all innovation.

Such an academy might also by precedent sanction such words as "criticable," "makeable," "hopeably," "fixable," "elsewhen" (elsewhere), "farness" (nearness), "outgo" (income), "beginningless" (endless) and many other apparently strange but useful forms, but the idea perhaps is utopian. Yet the man in the street readily assimilates such neologisms as "plunderbund," "talkfest," "brainstorm" and the like, for he is above all things a practical fellow who never mistakes a bath sponge for a sponge bath, a houseboat for a boathouse or a billboard for a boardbill!

Now, in Ilo and Esperanto we have all such ideas as the foregoing, with a very great number more, neatly and accurately expressed, at least in the first named system, for it has borrowed the conveniences of six of the greatest living languages—German, English, French, Italian, Russian and Spanish, (the DEFIRS which its dictionary appends to a root), while ignoring their shortcomings.

Thus (and this I consider to be almost the crux of the whole question, the very marrow in our bone of amicable contention), on the basis of "the maximum of internationality," the Ilists select a "root" that is common to the greatest numbers of millions, when they can, by "word-building" with one or two of the well-defined affixes or "exponents," carry it to its fifth, tenth and even twentieth "power," each expressing a different shade of meaning and without materially increasing the root's length. I ask, can the same be done with any word in English, or any other known tongue?

Let us take the international \surd *futur-* which can also be found in such non-Romanic tongues as German and Russian, and we build *futuro*, the noun; *futura*, the adjective; and *future*, the adverb "futurely," which last form the English lacks, while the same form must serve for both its noun and adjective.

Again, touching now upon the feature of brevity with clarity, take the lengthy name *United States of (North) America*, and *Usono* is understood by Esperantists and Ilists alike, while *usonano* gives us the inhabitant or citizen thereof exactly, instead of the altogether too generic term "American," who may really be a native of Canada or any of the South American republics. So Ilo is a contraction of *internaciona linguo* and happens to mean, appropriately enough, an "instrument," with many derivatives therefrom. But this method of monogramic abbreviation is used sparingly.

Now, without going into the defect of our many homonyms

like peace and piece, pain and pane, a defect also common to other natural languages and which is of course eliminated from an artificial one, much as artificial teeth successfully replace bad natural ones, let us here state a few postulates now generally accepted by all students of this latest branch of philology, the artificial—of which Dr. L. Couturat and his confrere, Dr. Leau, are undoubtedly the greatest living authorities and historians, and to whom, with de Beaufront, “the father of Esperanto in France,” we are largely indebted for the later product, Ilo. Philologists now generally concede:

1. That all artificial languages are secondary to, and are never intended to supersede the mother tongue.
2. That the primary use of any artificial language is for commerce, science and travel and that it is as yet premature to attempt any literary efforts or translations (although I am aware the Esperantists have disregarded this rule).
3. That such artificial language should be founded on an *a posteriori* basis and not an *a priori* one (i. e., we should draw material from existing languages rather than coin previously unheard-of words, like those composing Zamenhof’s correlative table).
4. That a good artificial language, constructed with the “maximum of internationality,” can be learned with advantage by young and old, as laying a foundation and easy entrance to many other languages, living or dead.
5. That the analytic is preferable to the agglutinative form.

To these postulates I should add the formula found by that clear-thinking Dane and great philologist, Prof. Otto Jespersen, who has since laid down the axiom (the original is easily read): “La max bona linguo internationa esas ta, qua prizentas la max granda faciloso por la max multa homi,” and, anticipating the inquiry, will state that the foregoing is in neither Latin nor Danish, Italian nor Spanish, nor yet Esperanto.

Religion is much akin and only comes secondary to language, and who has counted the number of systems of the former that have been *created* and flourished? And naturally any such *bela ideo* as Esperanto, like a religion, attracts many idealists and possibly a few intolerant or mediumly-educated people, mostly monoglots with a growing knowledge of their idol, for which they too often make the most extravagant and preposterous claims.

Yet there are many notable exceptions, like the veteran Richard

H. Geoghegan of Fairbanks, Alaska. Only a few of his intimate correspondents know of the profound learning and very great linguistic attainments of this modest and versatile man, with whom it seems to be a recreation to study another language about every three months and who has done an immense amount of correspondence in Esperanto since 1889, with Jón Jónson of Iceland, M. Bourdaloue of New Caledonia and with many others as widely distributed, all tending to show how much can be done with an international language and that the idea is becoming a practical reality.

I cannot agree with Dr. Carus that "irregularities originate according to our needs"; rather do they grow according to our elemental minds or our slovenly habit of thought. Granted that "artificial languages would soon introduce certain irregularities," yet they would only be local or at most national departures from the standard of purity and excellence laid down by their Academy or Fundamento (which latter is like the Koran to the Arabic).

True, as Dr. Carus intimates, we may not have attained the ultimate, for if we had, we would at once commence to retrograde and decay; our product is "not perfect, but always perfectible." But the Delegation which met at Paris in October, 1907, for the adoption of some international language, laid a very solid foundation when, of the many systems presented, it accepted Dr. Zamenhof's creation, but subject to the modifications proposed by de Beaufront, Couturat, Jespersen and others, and which have since been incorporated and appear in its organ *Progreso*.

Possibly some great Oriental linguist, as yet unborn or now in the infantile dairy business, may some later day arise in his might and smite us on the ground that Ilo is altogether too European, but are we meantime to stand idle in the event of such a remote contingency? That would certainly not be progress, and he would surely be welcome to the laborious task of building an Asiatic rival, with Arabic-Hindustani-Chinese roots.

I can barely touch upon the inestimable scientific value of an international language, with a terminology constructed by specialists and acceptable to all scientists, nor what an instrument it will be as making for peace and righteousness. As I look across my desk I see several pigeonholes containing letters from various parts of the world, written clearly and concisely in an apparently strange idiom, yet one that seems far more flexible than my own great tongue, as euphonious as Spanish or Italian, phonetic, legible and brief; and I venture to assert that not one of your readers, be he of

English, French, Spanish or Italian extraction, will fail to almost instantly understand the following short specimen:

“La establiso di la internaciona linguo tute ne esas verko di personala inspireso, fantazio od arbitrio, sed verko di cienco e di pacienteso. Ni ne pretendas a neeroriveso e ne konsideras nia verko quale ideala. Ol esas simple verko di cienco, di koncienco e di bonvolo. Nia verko ne esas certe perfekta; sed, quo forsan plu valoras, ol esas sempre perfektigebla.”

In conclusion I must agree with Dr. Carus that the Esperantists at least have perhaps been far too hasty and over-anxious, and I must plead guilty as having been one of them. Certainly many of them have shown an unreasoning antagonism to even the most essential changes and reforms. When the Doctor suggested a system of pasigraphy some years ago, he did not attempt to force its acceptance, assert that it was “untouchable” or make any extraordinary claims for it. Nor yet, on the other hand, did he then raise any question as to its cerebral receptivity or acceptance through the optic instead of the auditory nerve! But why did he not suggest an already existing pasigraphy like the Chinese? And the anticipated answer that it is too cumbersome and unsuitable for international usage will also apply, with but slightly lesser force, to English or any other naturally evolved language.

And finally I ought not perhaps to forget a word of commendation for Mr. Strauss’s able and impartial argument, not forgetting to add, however, that M. Bollack has since given up any attempt to propagate his own system and thrown his forces with the Ilists.

ALEXANDER H. MACKINNON

SEATTLE, WASH.

A DEFENCE OF INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE.

In the October issue of your magazine you propose to have the problem of an artificial language discussed, and you proceed to express yourself adversely, while Mr. C. T. Strauss defends it, though, according to his own admission, rather from the point of view of a theoretical observer than as a practical adept of one of the many international language systems. Permit me to answer some of your criticisms, and to supplement the remarks of Mr. Strauss by some observations gathered from two years’ study and practical use of Esperanto, both in its primitive and in its new and simplified form (“International Language of the Delegation,” “Ido” or “Ilo”).